DECISION NOTICE
and
FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
for the
FOREST INTEGRATED WEED MANAGEMENT PROJECT
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

USDA Forest Service
Umpqua National Forest
Douglas County, Oregon

Decision

The Forest Integrated Weed Management Project Environmental Assessment (EA) documents a No-Action and two Action Alternatives for prevention and management of noxious weeds on the Umpqua National Forest. The EA also documents a non-significant amendment to the 1990 Umpqua National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan, as amended. I have decided to implement Alternative 2, as described in Chapter II of the EA (pages 12-17). This decision includes the implementation of mitigation measures and management requirements related to the implementation of the project.

The project area is located within the boundaries of the Umpqua National Forest, across all ranger districts.

My decision to implement Alternative 2 is based on information contained in the administrative record, including, but not limited to the EA, the mitigation measures and management requirements described in Chapter II of the EA, and the effects analysis described in Chapter III of the EA (pages 23-71). Alternative 2 will utilize integrated noxious weed management activities on all four Ranger Districts, initially on approximately 105 sites over the next five years. Integrated Weed Management is a process for managing noxious weeds that considers other resources, uses an interdisciplinary approach, and incorporates a variety of methods for prevention and control (FSM 2080.5).

Details of Alternative 2

Site-specific proposals for treatment of twelve species are considered under Alternative 2, including: false brome, Italian thistle, diffuse, spotted, and meadow knapweed, yellow starthistle, rush skeletonweed, French broom, yellow toadflax,

Japanese and giant knotweed, and gorse. The other species not mentioned above and including Scotch broom and tansy ragwort, would be treated as funding and staffing allow.

The Forest would use manual control methods on 42 infestations where the weeds would be physically removed or killed by pulling, cutting or digging (34 sites totaling about 155 acres), covered with plastic materials in a process called solarization (7 sites totaling about 5 acres), and/or shaded-out or crowded-out by planting other vegetation (1 site, totaling about 140 acres). On some locations, multiple methods would be used.

As part of the proposal, the Forest will use a new innovation from New Zealand that applies super-heated water in a steam mixture on 13 infestations (totaling about 72 acres) including yellow starthistle, spotted knapweed, and false brome on the Cottage Grove, Tiller, and Diamond Lake Ranger Districts. This system utilizes non-toxic foam made from a 100% sugar extract (from corn and coconuts) that is fully biodegradable. The foam is super-heated in water, that when applied, breaks down the cellular structure of the plant. The foam is heated in a truck or trailer-mounted machine, which would then be applied to the weed. Re-treatment is usually required 3-4 months after the initial application.

In addition, this proposal includes applying the herbicide picloram also known by its brand name Tordon 22K®, at about 50 locations totaling about 50 acres. The herbicide will be applied with backpack sprayers to relatively small areas on two of the ranger districts (North Umpqua and Diamond Lake) that are primarily along road-sides, and in particular, along portions of Highway 138. The picloram will be applied during the dry summer months, with a potential follow-up in late July or August to locate any missed plants or resprouts. Spraying will be repeated annually as needed over a five-year period. Not every site will be sprayed five times, since infestations are expected to progressively diminish with time. However, some of the larger infestation may receive up to five consecutive years of spot spray on individual plants.

More than one treatment type is proposed at some sites and different non-chemical treatments may occur if monitoring of the initial treatment shows that the treatment did not fully control or eradicate the infestation.

Prevention of noxious weeds involves detecting and ameliorating the conditions that cause or favor the presence of competing or unwanted vegetation. On the Umpqua, prevention of noxious weeds will focus on 1) educating Forest employees and public land users so that they can recognize weeds that do not yet occur within the Forest; 2) share information (annually or bi-annually) on noxious weed control

programs with the Oregon State Department of Agriculture and Douglas County Weed Board; 3) immediately initiate eradication of newly discovered priority noxious weed species, so as to slow or eliminate their establishment; and 4) implement the following mitigation measures and management requirements during all ground disturbing projects:

- Require all ground disturbing machinery to be washed prior to entering and leaving the Forest;
- Restrict the feeding of hay to livestock and big game animals on public lands, then monitor feeding sites for noxious weed presence;
- Require the use of certified weed free seed for all revegetation projects; and
- Revegetate disturbed sites as soon as practical using native species.

Locations of all proposed treatments specifically avoid known sensitive species sites. The proposal is not within or adjacent to an inventoried roadless areas, nor is it proposed to occur within any wilderness area. All proposed treatments use existing roads; no new roads would be created with this project.

The integrated weed management strategy that will be established will focus on prevention of new noxious weed populations, as described above. This integrated noxious weed management strategy would be adopted by the Forest as a non-significant amendment to the Umpqua National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan.

The non-significant Forest Plan amendment will read as follows, with the language additions for the Plan noted in bold-face font:

> Page IV-91 of the Land and Resource Management Plan, under Forest Goals, Pest Management, change the sentence to read: Protect forest resources from unacceptable losses due to destructive forest pests **and invasive noxious weeds**.
>
> Page IV-92, under Forest Objectives, Pest Management, add the following: **3. Prevention of noxious weeds is the preferred strategy for control. Following prevention, early detection and treatment (using an integrated weed management strategy) will minimize the spread of noxious weeds. Established infestations will be prioritized and treated using an integrated weed management strategy as funding becomes available.**
>
> Page IV-93, under Forest-wide Multiple-use Resource Management Standards and Guidelines, Protection - Pest Management, add the following:

3. **Integrated weed management prevention and treatment strategies will be used to treat noxious weeds within the constraints of laws, policies, and regulations and to meet Forest Management objectives. Methods may include manual (mowing, clipping, grubbing), biological, heated steam, competitive seeding, competitive planting, solarization, prescribed fire, grazing, chemical, or other applicable methods designed to control and/or eradicate the noxious weed. Biological controls tested and sanctioned by the US Department of Agriculture would be allowed to occur. Manual control methods within disturbed sites, such as along roads, trailheads, landings and within administrative sites would be allowed at any time.**
4. **Require all ground disturbing machinery to be washed prior to entering and leaving the Forest, using the appropriate timber sale contract provisions and construction contract requirements;**
5. **Restrict the feeding of hay to livestock and big game animals on public lands; monitor any feeding sites for noxious weed presence;**
6. **Require the use of certified weed free seed for all revegetation projects; and**
7. **Revegetate disturbed sites as soon as practical using native species unless there is no immediate resource concern and the site is anticipated to revegetate naturally to native species to desired cover standards. Otherwise, non-invasive non-natives will be used.**

Page IV-94, under Outputs and Resources Summary: Protection, add the following after the last paragraph:

The integrated weed management program is the responsibility of the Natural Resources staff area. Thorough inventories on each District will be conducted and input into a GIS database on a yearly basis. Implement a complete monitoring and evaluation program to tract prevention and treatment activities and to determine the effectiveness. Prevention and early treatment of noxious weeds is the preferred strategy for control and/or eradication of noxious weeds.

Criteria for Treatment of New Sites

A set of criteria that can be used for future noxious weed problems that may occur will also be established. Detailed criteria and treatment types are found in the appendices of the EA. Sites that are discovered subsequent to completion of this assessment will require evaluation and potential treatment. If the effects are

found to be within the scope of this assessment, then these new populations will also be treated. The following criteria are designed to prescribe the potential treatment methods that would be effective and consistent with this Decision Notice and Finding of No Significant Impact within certain types of sites. For the purposes of this project, noxious weed species are grouped at follows:

1. **High Priority Annuals:** Yellow Starthistle, (Wooly Distaff Thistle), Italian Thistle, (Puncturevine)[1]
2. **Low Priority Annuals:** Medusahead Rye
3. **High Priority Perennials and Biennials:** Spotted Knapweed, Diffuse Knapweed, Meadow Knapweed, Rush Skeletonweed, False Brome, Gorse, Spanish Broom, Scotch Broom, French Brome, Portuguese Broom, Yellow Toadflax, Giant Knotweed, Japanese Knotweed, English Ivy, Sulfur Cinquefoil, (Russian Knapweed), Purple Loosestrife, Milk Thistle, Houndstongue, Hydrilla, Poison Hemlock, South American Waterweed (Elodea), and (Yellow Nutsedge)
4. **Low Priority Perennials and Biennials:** Bull thistle, Canada Thistle, Tansy Ragwort, St. Johnswort, Himalayan Blackberry, English Ivy, Field Bindweed

Treatments of future noxious weeds that are found in the future or identified subsequent to this decision will be limited to the following types of sites:

A. Roads, road shoulders, cut-slopes, road-fill, and gabion barriers.
B. Clearcuts, plantations, landings, skid-trails, staging areas, fire drop-points, fire camps, and other cleared or compacted forest sites.
C. Quarries, rock pits, mines, adits, cinder, rock, tailings, or soil piles, and clearings associated with rock or mineral operations.
D. Recreation sites including campgrounds, trails, trailheads, picnic areas, boat and raft launches, parking areas, lookouts, and horse corrals.
E. Hydroelectric features and facilities including canals, flumes, transmission lines, distribution lines (powerlines), forebays, powerhouses, and penstock.
F. Natural meadows and openings including woodlands, rock outcrops, and wetlands.
G. Wilderness, threatened, endangered, or sensitive plant or animal sites.
H. Cultural Heritage sites including rock cairns, lithic scatters or any area with evidence of historic occupation where disruption of the soil profile could impact the integrity of the site.

Treatment methods for these future sites include:

---

[1] Species within parenthesis are "detection" species that have not been located on the Umpqua NF, but their current range and habitat requirements suggest they could move onto the Forest.

1. Hand-pulling or grubbing out with pulaski or hoe;
2. Digging or use of weed-winch to uproot weeds;
3. Mowing;
4. Steam treatment;
5. Use of the herbicide Picloram using a hand-held nozzle at a rate of 2 pts/ac. (0.5 lbs. a.e/ac.);
6. Solarization;
7. Biological controls;
8. Livestock grazing;
9. Use of prescribed fire;
10. Competitive seeding;
11. Competitive planting;
12. No action.

Table 2 displays the potential treatment options for groups of weeds, by site type. The criteria to determine the appropriate treatment will be based on the species, the number of plants at the site, the potential of causing damage or of spreading, and the location of the infestation.

Table 2. Potential Treatment Options for Weed Species Groups at Selected Site Types.

	Weed Groups			
Site Types	High-Priority Annuals	Low-Priority Annuals	High-Priority Perennials & Biennials	Low-Priority Perennials & Biennials
Roads	1,4,10	4,6,11,12	1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,10	1,2,3,4,6,7,10,12
Clearcuts	1,4,6,7,10,11	4,6,9,10,11,12	1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,10,11	1,2,3,4,7,8,10,11,12
Quarries	1,4,6,7,10	4,6,10,12	1,2,3,4,5,6,7,10	1,2,3,4,6,7,10,12
Recreation	1,4,6,7,10,11	4,6,10,11,12	1,2,3,4,6,7,10,11	1,2,3,4,6,7,10,11,12
Hydro	1,4,6,7,10,11	4,6,10,11,12	1,2,3,4,5,6,7,10,11	1,2,3,4,6,7,10,11,12
Meadows	1,4,6,7,8,9,10,11	4,6,8,9,10,11,12	1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11	1,2,3,4,6,7,8,9,10,11,12
Sensitive*	1,7	4,6,10,12	1,2,3,4,6,7,10,11	1,2,3,46,7,10,11,12
Cultural*	1,4,6,7,10	4,6,10,11,12	1,3,4,5,6,7,10	1,3,4,6,7,10,11,12

* The treatments listed would normally be expected to be compatible with these types of sites. However, any treatment that could cause a negative affect upon any threatened, endangered, or sensitive species or a cultural heritage site would require additional environmental analysis and would not be covered under this Environmental Assessment.

Mitigation Measures and Best Management Practices (BMPs):

Noxious Weed Spread

- Wash all ground disturbing machinery slated to do work on the Forest before entering and leaving the Forest to reduce the potential spread of noxious weeds.

- Workers involved in noxious weed treatments would be made aware of rare plant sites in the vicinity of work being done to avoid inadvertent damage to rare plants or their habitats.

Fisheries and Wildlife

- To protect fisheries resources from hazardous chemicals, a spill plan would be required by the contractor. The fueling of any equipment used to apply heated foam would occur away from streams. All fuel storage would meet spill plan specifications. Spill containment materials will be on site during operational periods.

- Restrict all project operations (use of power equipment) creating above ambient noise levels between January 1 - July 31 to minimize disturbance to spotted owls and peregrine falcons.

Cultural Resources

- In the event that an unknown historic or prehistoric site is discovered in the course of the project, the activity will be stopped and the appropriate measures will be taken to protect the site.

- For site 615030023, manual disturbance can only occur to a depth of less than 10 cm. No other disturbance is to occur.

- For site 615010004, manual disturbance may only occur within the road maintenance prism. No other disturbance is to occur.

- For site 615030001, a site determination must be completed prior to reforestation efforts. If the proposed planting occurs outside of the site boundary, it may proceed as proposed. If the proposed planting is located within the site, data recovery and/or mitigation will occur prior

to ground disturbance, or a manual method that avoids ground disturbance will be proposed in lieu of planting.

Herbicide Use

- A 50-foot no spray buffer will be applied along all live stream courses. A live stream course is one that is flowing water during the time that herbicide would by applied (June-August).

- No more than 0.5 pounds a.e/acre will be applied per year.

- Herbicide mixing will occur in designated areas, well away from live or intermittent stream courses.

- Application rates for Tordon 22K® will follow the EPA approved label directions for Tordon 22K®. This includes strict adherence to application rates, mixing methods, rinsing, and disposal of containers.

- The Forest Service personnel in charge of the project will be Qualified Applicator Certified. This BMP will help avoid the misuse of the herbicide and thus decrease the risk of contaminating water or non-target areas.

- Prior to the start of application, all spray equipment will be calibrated to ensure accuracy of delivered amounts. Periodically during application, equipment will be re-checked for calibration. Non-toxic colorants or dyes will be added to the herbicide mixture to determine placement and length of drift. This BMP insures even coverage without over application in order to meet EPA label requirements.

- The project-specific spill plan will be followed if any spills occur with this project. Contract application workers including personnel for the Oregon Department of Agriculture and Forest Service employees involved in the project will review the spill plan prior to beginning work. Spill kits will be required in both Forest Service and/or contractor's or Oregon Department of Agriculture vehicles. This BMP will reduce risks associated with accidental spills.

- No more herbicide will be brought to the work area in any one day than can be used in that day. No more herbicide will be mixed at any one location than can be used at that location in that day. The containers of

unmixed, concentrated herbicide will be tightly sealed and secured inside an enclosed vehicle such as a pick-up with a canopy. While on the job sites, the concentrated herbicide will be locked up at all times except when needed for mixing. All diluted herbicide in backpack sprayers shall be used up on location and not transported between work sites and back from the job site at the end of the work day.

- All empty herbicide containers will be triple rinsed. The rinse water will be used as mix water in the backpack sprayers resulting in no need for rinse water disposal. The triple-rinsed, empty containers will be punctured (to disallow re-use) and disposed of at a legal dump site. Backpack sprayers will be rinsed in a manner that does not allow contaminated water to enter streams or water bodies.

- Spray application equipment or personnel will not be allowed within 50 feet of a stream except during transit to and from the job sites which will require traveling in vehicles in roads that are along and across streams.

- Application will cease when weather parameters exceed label requirements. Application will not occur when wind speeds exceed 5 mph, when it is raining, or when the forecast has greater than a 70 percent chance of rain within 36 hours of spraying.

- To reduce the likelihood that western pond turtles are killed, injured, as a result of this project, a wildlife biologist will survey suitable nesting habitat within the project area immediately prior to the application of herbicide picloram. If the species is detected, appropriate protections measures will be implemented.

Decision Rationale

The following summarizes my reasons for selecting Alternative 2:

1. Alternative 2 meets the purpose and need for action by responding to all of the elements of the purpose and need. Alternative 2 provides for prevention of future noxious weed populations, reduction or elimination of existing noxious weed populations, and gives the forest the ability to treat future noxious weed populations.

2. Alternative 2 gives the Forest the broadest range of tools for treating noxious weeds.

I believe that Alternative 2 provides the Forest with the best opportunity to effectively and efficiently prevent future weed populations and treat existing noxious weeds.

Watershed Analysis

I have also considered the Watershed Analyses for the 5th field watersheds where herbicides may be used. Alternative 2 of this project does not conflict with any recommendations made in those Watershed Analyses.

Northwest Forest Plan Consistency and Findings

Aquatic Conservation Strategy (ACS): Based on the project level evaluation of the environmental effects documented in the EA, the fisheries and wildlife biological evaluations, and the ACS consistency documentation found on page 52 of the EA, I find that the project is consistent with and does not prevent attainment of the nine objectives of the ACS, and is consistent with the Record Of Decision for the Northwest Forest Plan.

The Matrix of Pathways and Indicators assesses the current condition and effects of the proposed activities of relevant indicators of watershed conditions and is used by NOAA Fisheries during formal consultation. Effects of activities are rated as to whether they restore, maintain, or degrade an environmental indicator. No short term or long term "degrades" determinations will occur as a result of implementing this project.

Survey and Manage Species: The ROD requires surveys to be conducted for several species for which viability is a concern in late successional forests. No survey and manage species will be affected by this project.

Other Alternatives Considered

The Umpqua National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan (LRMP), as amended is the principle policies under which this action was developed. An analysis of the proposal was conducted in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the implementing regulations of 40 CFR 1508. The purpose and need for the proposed action is described in detail in Chapter 1 of the EA (pages 3 and 4).

The "Alternatives Considered" section of the EA includes a description of the other alternatives considered in detail. The following briefly summarizes those alternatives and discloses why they were not selected.

Alternative 1: Under this alternative, the no-action alternative, no actions would be taken to reduce or eliminate noxious weeds on the Forest, with the exception of those efforts that are ongoing in other projects documented in an Environmental Assessment or Environmental Impact Statement. No manual control (pulling), planting native trees or shrubs to shade out the weed species, use of heated foam, use of herbicides, solarization (using black plastic to shade out the weeds), or mowing or clipping of weeds would occur. Existing populations of noxious weeds would remain and would likely continue to propagate.

This alternative was not selected because it would not meet the purpose of and need for action. Noxious weed treatment is a national priority and one of the top 5 "great issues" identified by the Chief of the Forest Service. Not taking action against these species would be irresponsible and would continue to contribute to the spread of these weeds. I believe that this creates an unacceptable risk to the native species on this forest.

Alternative 3: This alternative was developed to respond to concerns over aquatics, wildlife, effects of herbicide on human health, and the promotion of the additional use of herbicides. This alternative incorporates all aspects of the proposed action (manual, planting, heated foam, and solarization), but excludes the use of herbicides. No herbicides would be used for control of noxious weeds throughout the project area. All of the 50 sites proposed for herbicide use under Alternative 2 would be treated manually.

This alternative would incorporate an integrated noxious weed strategy that would exclude herbicide use for the forest and would result in a non-significant amendment to the Umpqua National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan, but would exclude the use of herbicides. In addition, the same criteria for new sites that could be used for future noxious weed problems that may occur would also be established, but use of herbicides would be excluded.

This alternative was not selected because it would not provide the most efficient and effective method for treating some species of noxious weeds. By excluding herbicide use, some existing populations of weeds are likely to continue. This also creates an unacceptable risk to the native species on this forest.

ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED, BUT ELIMINATED FROM DETAILED STUDY

An alternative was considered that incorporated all aspects of the proposed action (manual, planting, heated foam, herbicide, and solarization), but excludes the use of Picloram in areas where there may be a potential for delivery of herbicides into streams via percolation through the soil. These areas may be roadsides that drain into streams, or areas that may be adjacent to streams.

> This alternative was eliminated from detailed study because it was similar to Alternative 3 and has no measurable differences in effects when compared to Alternative 3.

An alternative was considered that would incorporate all aspects of the proposed action (manual, planting, heated foam, herbicide, and solarization), but uses glyphosate in areas where there may be a potential for delivery of herbicide into streams via percolation through the soil. These areas may be roadsides that drain into streams, or areas that may be adjacent to streams.

> This alternative was eliminated from detailed study because the fisheries biologist found that there would be no difference in the environmental effects from using Glyphosate over Picloram at the one site that the Glyphosate would have been applied to and there would not be any measurable difference between this alternative and the proposed action.

Public Participation

Internal and external scoping was conducted as part of the analysis process. The scoping process for the Umpqua National Forest Integrated Weed Management Project first began in October of 1995, when the Forest proposed a project to assess and treat existing noxious weed populations. The original project was put on hold, pending the outcome of a Regional project that would include additional methods to treat noxious weeds. However, regional timeframes did not move forward in a timely manner, and many of the existing noxious weed populations on the Umpqua are expanding. The proposed action from the original project was revised to include all new sites and the project was again listed in the Umpqua National Forest's Schedule of Proposed Actions in July of 2002, which is mailed to over 150 people or organizations. Based on previous interest in the project and anticipated future interest, a scoping summary was sent out to about 50 individuals in March of 2003, which included a notice sent to the National Coalition for Alternatives to Pesticides. Two responses for additional information were received.

Finding of Forest Plan Consistency and Finding of LRMP Non-Significance

This decision tiers to the Umpqua National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan Environmental Impact Statement (Forest Plan, 1990). I have ensured that the decision is consistent with the Forest Plan goals, objectives, and standards.

FSH 1909.12, Section 5.32, outlines the factors to be used to determine whether a proposed change to the LRMP is significant or not significant, based on National Forest Management Act requirements. A discussion of each of these four factors follows.

1. Timing. Determine whether the change is necessary during or after the plan period. In most cases, the later the change during the planning period, the less likely it is to be significant for the forest plan. The proposed amendment is necessary now, and is occurring prior to the plan revision, which is estimated to begin in 2007. Therefore, I have determined that timing is not considered to be a significant factor related to the amendment.

2. Location and Size. Define the relationship of the affected area to the overall planning area. In most cases, the smaller the area affected by the change, the less likely it is to be significant for the forest plan. The proposed amendment would institute forest integrated weed management practices as Standards and Guidelines. Most of these practices have occurred as part of project planning for several years. Where these projects occur, they are limited in time and space. Therefore, I have determined that the location and size of the area involved in the proposed amendment are not considered significant.

3. Goals, Objectives, and Outputs. Determine whether the change would alter long-term levels of goods and services projected by the forest plan. The proposed amendment would not change existing uses of the forest. Therefore, this proposal would not result in changes in the level of goods and services currently being produced, which are consistent with levels projected by the LRMP. I have determined that the proposed amendment is not significant based on this factor.

4. Management Prescription. Determine whether the change in a management prescription is only for a specific situation or whether it would apply to future decisions throughout the planning area. The proposed amendment would not change management of existing projects; future projects already use the Standards and Guidelines as mitigation. Therefore, I have

determined that the proposed amendment is not significant based on this factor.

After consideration of these factors, I have concluded that the proposed amendment would not represent a significant change to the LRMP.

Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI)

Based on the documentation in the Forest Integrated Weed Management Project EA and Analysis File, I have determined the following with regard to the intensity of this project:

1. The Environmental Assessment provides sufficient information to determine that this project will not have a significant impact (either adverse or beneficial) on the land and its natural resources, air quality, or water quality (EA pages 23-74).

2. Considering the remoteness of the project in relation to local and regional population centers, the mitigation measures and management requirements associated with the proposal (EA pages 17-20), the effects disclosure in the EA (EA pages 23-74), especially the human health risk analysis (EA pages 25-33), the information contained in the Analysis File, the Aquatic Conservation Strategy documentation, the likelihood of the project affecting the public's health and safety is low.

3. The supporting documentation located in the EA and in the Analysis File section of the Forest Integrated Weed Management Project EA provides sufficient information to determine that this project will not negatively affect any known unique characteristics of the geographic area such as park lands, prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers, or ecologically critical areas (EA page 69-70).

4. The degree of controversy with regard to effects on the quality of the human environment are limited and considered not significant. No comments were received during the 30-day public comment period. I find that there is no controversy, which therefore, does not satisfy the threshold for the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

5. The proposed integrated weed management activities have occurred previously on the Umpqua and on other National Forests. The amount of herbicide proposed for use is small and the risks have been documented. No impacts to the human environment that are highly uncertain or involve unique or unknown risks have been identified in this analysis (EA pages 25-33 and 69-71).

6. The proposed integrated weed management activities are well established practices and do not establish a precedent for future actions.

7. I have reviewed the impacts of those past, present, and reasonably foreseeable actions described in the Environmental Effects Section of the Forest Integrated Weed Management Project EA (EA pages 23-74) and find that this action will not have a significant cumulative impact on the environment.

8. The Cultural Resources Report and Mitigation Measures contained in the Analysis File section of the Forest Integrated Weed Management Project EA and the associated disclosure in the EA (EA pages 68) discloses that three sites have the potential to be affected. Mitigation for these sites is listed above. By following these mitigations, no direct, indirect, or cumulative effects to cultural resources are expected to occur. Management requirements included with Alternative 2 (EA page 18) and the mitigation measures stipulated in this notice are intended to prevent the loss or destruction of unknown cultural resources.

9. Based on the information disclosed in the Forest Integrated Weed Management Project EA (EA pages 17-39), and the wildlife and fisheries biological evaluations, I have determined that this action will not jeopardize any species listed or proposed for listing under the Endangered Species Act. For wildlife species, I base this on the "no effects" determination by the wildlife biologist. For fish species, I base this on the "no effects" determination by the fisheries biologist.

10. Laws imposed for the protection of the environment provided the framework for the 1990 Umpqua National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan (LRMP), as amended. From the documentation provided in the Forest Integrated Weed Management Project EA (EA pages 70-71) and Analysis File, I find that the integrated weed management activities do not threaten a violation of Federal, State, or local law imposed for the protection of the environment.

From the preceding, I find that the Forest Integrated Weed Management Project does not constitute a major Federal action that would significantly affect the quality of the human environment. Therefore, an Environmental Impact Statement is not necessary.

In accordance with the National Forest Management Act and other applicable laws, I also find the following:

The project is consistent with the goals and objectives of the Umpqua National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan, as amended, and will help achieve the desired future condition of the Umpqua National Forest.

This project complies with Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act. The project biologists both found that this project will not jeopardize any proposed or listed threatened or endangered species or their habitat. This project has been assessed under the requirements listed in the Magnuson-Stevens Act and as Essential Fish Habitat. No effects are expected to occur.

Implementation of Decision

In accordance with Forest Service Regulations, 36 CFR 215.5, notice of the opportunity to comment on the Forest Integrated Weed Management Project EA was published in the Roseburg News Review on May 13, 2003. The EA was also posted on the Forest's website. The Environmental Assessment was mailed to the two people who requested notice and who were involved in the scoping process. No comments were received during the 30-day comment period. Based on the receipt of no comments, implementation will occur in accordance with Forest Service Regulations 36 CFR 215.10(c).

Administrative Review

In accordance with 36 CFR 215.8(3), this decision is not subject to appeal, as no comments were received. Implementation may occur immediately upon publication of the notice of this decision in the Roseburg News Review.

Contact Person: For further information, contact Debbie Anderson, Project Leader, North Umpqua Ranger District, Umpqua National Forest, 18782 North Umpqua Highway, Glide, OR 97443, (541)-496-3532.

Margaret Ehlers

JAMES A. CAPLAN
Forest Supervisor

6/23/03
Date Signed

6/26/03
Date Published